

Remarks

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-16 are pending in the present application. The drawings stand objected to. Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph. Claims 1-5, 7, 9, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claims 1, 6, 7, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claim 1 has been amended to include claims 5 and 10, and claims 5 and 10 have been cancelled.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to the Drawings:

In regard to the objection to the drawings, replacement drawings are enclosed.
Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 112, Second paragraph:

In regard to this rejection, the relevant claims have been amended.
Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) (Claims 1-5) (Chen):

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Chen does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements.

In regard to claim 1, Chen does not disclose, teach, or suggest, among other things, a rigid connection mechanism extending from the leg exercise mechanism for detachably and rigidly connecting the leg exercise mechanism to the seat support of the office chair, the rigid connection mechanism including a collar securable to the single vertical seat support of the office chair and a brace securable to one of the lateral extending arms for providing a secure, rigid connection between the leg exercise device and the office chair.

Because dependent claims 2-4 add further elements/limitations to independent claim 1, these claims are also not disclose, taught, or suggested by Chen.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 102(b) (Claims 1, 7, 9, and 10) (Nelson):

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claim elements of claim 1.

In regard to claim 1, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest, among other things, a rigid connection mechanism extending from the leg exercise mechanism for detachably and rigidly connecting the leg exercise mechanism to the seat support of the office chair, the rigid connection mechanism including a collar securable to the single vertical seat support of the office chair and a brace securable to one of the lateral extending arms for providing a secure, rigid connection between the leg exercise device and the office chair. Although Nelson discloses a leg exercise device sized to fit beneath the desk of a user, and an anchoring device adapted to be affixed to the user's chair, Nelson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above claim elements/limitations of claim 1.

Because dependent claims 7 and 9 add further elements/limitations to independent claim 1, these claims are also not disclose, taught, or suggested by Nelson.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) (Claims 1 and 6) (Dranselka):

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Dranselka does not disclose, teach, or suggest claims 1 and 6.

In regard to independent claim 1, Dranselka does not disclose, teach, or suggest, among other things, a leg exercise device for use with an office chair including a rigid connection mechanism extending from the leg exercise mechanism for detachably and rigidly connecting the leg exercise mechanism to the seat support of the office chair, the rigid connection mechanism including a collar securable to the single vertical seat support of the office chair and a brace securable to one of the lateral extending arms for providing a secure, rigid connection between the leg exercise device and the office chair.

In contrast, Dranselka teaches a portable pedaling device that is attachable to a conventional chair without alteration including a rear member which is held rigidly between a pair of opposing legs of a chair by the application of compressive force. In further contrast, this member consists of a center section which contains telescoping sections on either end, each of which have crescent shaped end pieces.

Therefore, Dranselka fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above claim elements/limitations of claim 1.

Because dependent claim 6 adds further elements/limitations to independent claim 1, this claim is also not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Dranselka.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) (Claims 1, 7, and 8) (Nelson):

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest claims 1, 7 and 8.

In regard to independent claim 1, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest, among other things, a leg exercise device for use with an office chair including a rigid connection mechanism extending from the leg exercise mechanism for detachably and rigidly connecting the leg exercise mechanism to the seat support of the office chair, the rigid connection mechanism including a collar securable to the single vertical seat support of the office chair and a brace securable to one of the lateral extending arms for providing a secure, rigid connection between the leg exercise device and the office chair.

In contrast, Nelson teaches a leg exercise device sized to fit beneath the desk of a user, and an anchoring device attached to the exercise device in either one of two embodiments; 1) where the anchor means includes a tray whereupon the base of a chair may rest, or 2) the anchor means includes a barrier bar slidably positionable in relation to the leg exercise means, with the barrier bar being oriented in a direction generally perpendicular to the direction in which the barrier bar slides. Neither of Nelson's embodiments disclose, teach, or suggest Applicant's rigid connection mechanism to a single vertical seat support.

Therefore, Nelson fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above claim elements/limitations of claim 1.

Because dependent claims 7 and 8 add further elements/limitations to independent claim 1, these claims are also not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Nelson.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) (Claims 1, 7, and 11) (Nelson):

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth immediately above. Claims 7 and 11, as dependent claims, add further limitations to claim 1 and are therefore also not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Nelson.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully submits that he does not acquiesce to any of the positions set forth in the Office Action(s). If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP

Dated: July 10, 2008

By: /Stephen C. Beuerle/
Stephen C. Beuerle
Reg. No. 38,380

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900